

REMARKS

This amendment cancels rejected claim 17 and adds a new claim 43, and amends language in the specification conforming one part of the specification and drawings to other parts of the specification, particularly with respect to addition of the sub-assemblies of a multi-membered mode into a unitary mode. Replacement Sheets and Annotated Sheets are also provided, corresponding to the content of the Replacement Sheets. No new matter has been introduced in the amendment or in the Replacement Drawings.

Rejection: 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) – Claim 17

Canceled claim 17 was rejected as being anticipated by US Patent 2,684,822. The cancellation of claim 17 moots this rejection. New claim 43 was added which includes the language of claim 17 with the addition of:

“means, coupled to said first plurality of repetitive positioning means and to said engaging means, for repetitively reconfiguring said plurality of positioning means between a unitary mode and a multi-membered mode wherein said unitary mode combines two or more of said plurality of positioning means into a single positioning means and wherein said multi-membered mode separates said single positioning means into two or more of said plurality of positioning means.”

It is believed that new claim 43 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Objection: Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing “to show the couplers for attaching each leg into a single component as described in the specification.” It is respectfully asserted that the specifics of the coupler are not essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention. The specification as originally filed, describes, for example that the

coupler may be an extended threaded member, though other engagement systems like snap couplers or ball/socket systems may be used. There are many different types of mechanical couplings that may be used to permit the assemblies to couple to each other and to other identified structures as appropriate, such as the mounting head or the like. A preferred embodiment is used with standardized photography mounting systems and the couplings in that instance are preferred to be compatible with applicable standards for the most flexibility in reconfigurations. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for showing details of one of many different types of coupling systems.

Rejection: 35 U.S.C. § 112 – first paragraph

Claims 2–31 and 40–42 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph as assertedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The rejection asserts that the claims fail to enable one to make and use the claimed invention – that the specification and drawing do not clearly describe the invention. The rejection references Figures 1–3 (unitary mode) in which each assembly 110 is made up of multiple sub-assemblies and requests that this structure be shown in the drawing. The Replacement Drawings, and amendments to the specification, are believed to satisfy this request. Specifically, the assembly 110 is shown segmented into multiple parts, each labeled and described.

The rejection reasserts a request for couplers, suggesting that they are essential to transitioning the invention from one mode to another mode. The discussion above regarding the couplers is respectfully reasserted here. Additionally, the couplers are important for the transition between modes, however it is respectfully asserted that they are not essential to be shown as they are believed to be well-understood to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding Figure 5, the rejection identifies that assemblies extend from a side of mounting head 430 without explicit identification of the attachment system. The Replacement Drawings, and amendments to the specification, are believed to satisfy this

request. Specifically, a mating coupler is represented by a generic coupler 435 shown added to the figures.

The rejection assert that the figures fail to show the mounting system as a single flexible system attached to a head and a plurality of legs attached to the head. The rejection points out that Figures 1–3 illustrate a head 120 while Figures 4–7 show a plurality of legs attached to an alternate head 410. It is believed to be understood that head 120 and head 410 are interchangeable and the efficiency of showing the more multiconfigurable head 410 in the context of Figures 4–7 does not distract the reader from understanding that the legs, whether intercoupled or separated, could be attached to either head 120 or head 410.

The rejections of claims 2–31 and 40–42 under § 112, first paragraph are respectfully asserted to be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael E. Woods/
Michael E. Woods
Registration No.: 33,466
PATENT LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL E.
WOODS
16 Hazel CT
San Rafael, California 94901-5223
(415) 419-5524
(415) 419-5523 (Fax)
Attorney For Applicant